



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Arne

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,132	12/05/2001	James M. McArdle	AUS920010929US1	8055
7590	05/19/2005		EXAMINER	
Frank C. Nicholas CARDINAL LAW GROUP Suite 2000 1603 Orrington Avenue Evanston, IL 60201			RAMPURIA, SATISH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,132	MCARDLE, JAMES M.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Satish S. Rampuria	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment received on 12/14/2004.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to claims 1-6 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. New Claims added by the applicant: None.
4. Claims amended by the applicant: 1-6.
5. Claims pending in the application: 1-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 4, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10-13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,612,898 to Huckins (hereinafter called Huckins) in view of US Publication No. 2004/0098640 to Smith (hereinafter called Smith).

Per claims 1, 4, 5, and 6:

Huckins discloses:

- A method of instrumenting logging of command execution of a command script
(Abstract, "providing a debug tracing log of the execution of the client components")
comprising:
 - defining a common log file (col. 2, lines 47-48 "outputting log data to a log file");

- writing at least one command of a command script to the common log file (col. 2, lines 5-7 “provide a logging or debug capability for monitoring the operation of the client component”); and

Huckins does not explicitly disclose providing a parallel command string to replace the command when it contains sensitive information, prior to it being written to the common log file.

However, Smith discloses in an analogous computer system providing a parallel command string to replace the command when it contains sensitive information, prior to it being written to the common log file (page 5, paragraph 44 “a LogEvent call that could potentially put sensitive or personal information into the log file 246, the developer also includes the “sensitive” flag... the log file is filtered to remove (detect and remove) any sensitive data prior to sending the log file to the repository 242”. Emphasis added).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the keeping the sensitive information from being logged as taught by Smith into the method of logging a command during the execution time in the log file as taught by Huckins. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to not log the sensitive information to provide security for the user to keep the logging information to be disclosed as suggested by Smith (page 1, paragraph 9).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Huckins discloses:

- wherein the command is assigned number for tracing execution and error conditions (see FIG. 3 and related discussion).

Claims 7 and 10-12 are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 4-6 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 respectively, above.

Claims 13 and 15-16 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 5-6 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 5-6 respectively, above.

8. Claims 2, 8, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huckins in view of Smith, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,892,898 to Fujii et al. (hereinafter called Fujii).

Per claim 2 :

Huckins does not explicitly disclose invoking an error routine that writes a return code of a command to the common log file when the return code is of a certain value.

However, Fujii discloses in an analogous computer system invoking an error routine that writes a return code of a command to the common log file when the return code is of a certain value (col. 4, lines 25-39 “Event logging routine... error information is resident within the subsystem's error message file and can be logged using normal error logging message calls...

event logging routine 32 accesses another subsystem's message catalog 40 using its definition table, retrieves the message for the passed event ID from the other subsystem's message catalog 40, and logs the special event ID").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of logging using event logging routine to log error messages differentiated by an ID as taught by Fujii into the method of logging a command during the execution time in the log file as taught by Huckins. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to write the error to the log file to provide a mechanism that identifies the source of a service error and obtains detailed error information at the time the error occurs as suggested by Fujii (col. 1, lines 52-67).

Claims 8 and 9 are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 2 and 3 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2 and 3 respectively, above.

Claim 14 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that:

(i) References (Huckins and Smith) do not teach or suggest each and every element, specifically for the limitation "providing a parallel command string to replace the command when the command contains sensitive information" as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13 (page 13 under Remarks).

Examiner's response:

(i) It is noted that the cited references (Huckins and Smith) fairly suggest "providing a parallel command string to replace the command when the command contains sensitive information", Examiner interprets that Smith filters the sensitive information (page 5, paragraph 44 "a LogEvent call that could potentially put sensitive or personal information into the log file 246, the developer also includes the "sensitive" flag... the log file is filtered to remove (detect and remove) any sensitive data prior to sending the log file to the repository 242". Emphasis added) the limitation providing parallel command would be obvious to replace the sensitive information has been suggested. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Huckins and Smith to produce a system to detect and remove, sensitive information from being logged. Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintained herein.

Applicant indicated that agreement was reached during the interview dated Oct. 26, 2004, It should be noted that there was no agreement reached on the limitation "providing a parallel command string to replace the command when the command contains sensitive information" since it has been suggested by the Smith.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is (571) 272-3732. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tuan Q. Dam** can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2191
05/02/2005



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER